HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 7 Saturday, February 16, 1957 Washington, D. C.

THE LIBRARY
WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Printed in Two Sections

News Section

Knowland Doctrine: The Knowland Doctrine has put the Eisenhower Doctrine in the shade — particularly since the Senate's combined Armed Services-Foreign Relations Committee has sharply amended the latter — thus runs comment on Capitol Hill today.

When the California Senator said that sanctions should not be applied to refractory little Israel unless applied to Soviet Russia, the "ten times guilty" butcher of Hungary, he riveted national attention on the developing issue of whether we should stay in the U.N. And when, before the dons and students of Georgetown University a few nights later, he arraigned the U.N. and declared that U.S. policy should "not be tied as a tail to a United Nations kite," he so broadened the controversy that the attention of all Americans was engaged. Such an analysis of the scene inevitably downgraded the other important struggle in the parliamentary arena.

That other contest is the protracted tussle over the Eisenhower Mideast resolution. Why — many ask — has the resolution taken so long, fallen so far short of the unanimous support which the Administration sought, and run so much afoul of Senate amendments? (A somewhat similar resolution to defend Formosa and nearby islands two years ago went through virtually unanimously and in a fraction of the time already devoted to the Mideast move.)

One reason is that, as a wag put it, "Dulles was caught with his emergency down." Indeed, since the launching of the resolution the first of the year, few alarming signs of impending hostility have appeared, and the urgency has faded.

Next, the Administration (and not merely Dulles) has made a bad job of presenting the issue to Congress. Originally, it looked as if black clouds over the Iranian border could well justify the extraordinary powers the President asked. But as the Committee hearings droned on, the admirals and generals failed to give any confirmation of this. The performance of Dulles and others only served to increase suspicion among members of Congress.

Congressman Lawrence Smith, for instance, wanted to know why we had to have such a declaration now when, over the past decade, the U.S. has by actual count delivered 18 high level warnings to the Soviets that we would offer forceful resistance to any aggression. "Could these warnings leave any doubt?" asked Smith. His verdict on the resolution was, in substance, "It's unnecessary."

This able and highly respected Republican Congressman expressed the reluctance which has marked the rank and file of both parties in Congress to rush through a resolution. The trouble which the resolution has encountered is, therefore, no merely partisan matter. Suspicion has spread that the real reason for the resolution was a design by the bureaucrats to open the gates to heavy spending in the Middle East — in short, more "globaloney." Hence the frustration felt by many as they vainly sought to limit the economic aid part of the bill.

Frustration usually finds a vent. That's why the Knowland Doctrine has displaced the Eisenhower Doctrine in the thinking of members of Congress.

Not Merely Gossip: *Collier's* magazine is dead, but an article it published last fall lives on in a controversy within the GOP. The piece, authored by Paul Hoffman, figure of the Republican left, attacked the right wing of the party in general and Senators Welker, Goldwater, McCarthy, Malone and Jenner specifically. Recently, Fulton Lewis, Jr., radio commentator, told the following story: that Helen Knowland, wife of the Senator, chided Hoffman for writing the piece; by helping defeat Welker, she said, Hoffman had kept the Republicans from capturing control of the Senate.

Now comes another story in which Hoffman — on the defensive — denies that he intended any harm to the party and claims that any such injury should not be attributed to him. The White House — according to this version — suggested the idea of the article to Hoffman. He wrote a draft and submitted it to members of the Palace Guard. The latter returned it to him, saying it was not strong enough and urging him to name names. Hoffman acceded to this request and the *Collier's* piece appeared in print in a new and tougher version, with the names.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

● The terms of the agreement between Ibn Saud and the U.S., just concluded at the recent meeting in Washington, have not yet been published. The diplomatic grapevine says that the price we agreed to pay for renewal of our lease on the Dhahran air base in Arabia includes a promise to deliver to Ibn Saud 76 jet planes and a large number of modern tanks. We shall also train Arabian pilots. One reason for not yet announcing these terms — say insiders — is that the promise to give Saud 76 jets would be exploited by Democratic politicos who would contrast this promise with the U.S. refusal to sell Israel several score of jets last year.

● At the coming meeting in Bermuda between British premier Harold MacMillan and President Eisenhower, it is expected that some steps will be taken in an effort to rehabilitate British prestige in the U.S., after the harm done to Anglo-American relations by the British and French attack on Suez. It is not known what the President will suggest to Mr. MacMillan. However, Congressional circles have been talking of one move which, if made by the British, would win great American applause and gratitude. That would be severance of British diplomatic relations with Red China. The British Foreign Office, it is believed, would not be entirely loath to do so. For, while Britain has accorded full diplomatic recognition to Red China, and has a diplomatic mission in Peiping, the Peiping Government has not reciprocated. All that Britain has in Peiping is a Chargé d'Affaires and all Red China has in London is a Chargé. Although London has suggested to Peiping that the two governments should exchange Ambassadors, the Reds have ignored the suggestion. Britain's hasty recognition of the Communist regime has placed her in a humiliating position.

Crusade for Economy: The grass-roots revolt against the high spending of the Eisenhower Budget has come to the fore as the most interesting current phenomenon in the Capital. *The Wall Street Journal* on February 13 devoted a feature article to this under the heading, "Rising Tide of Letters Assailing U.S. Spending Pours into Washington." And Whaley-Eaton, the oldest newsletter in Washington, remarks: "The flood of Congressional mail that always comes with a new session is concentrated this year on one topic — Government spending. The American people seem more aroused than usual."

What fuels this mail, this revolt in the hinterland? People will often act politically when given a lead by the press. In this instance, the Omaha *World-Herald* (which, with a quarter-of-a-million circulation, blankets Nebraska and western Iowa) has given an object lesson on how to put pressure on Congress not to spend. On February 6, the paper ran an editorial entitled "We Can and Will" (a phrase culled from a campaign speech by Eisenhower in 1952, promising the electorate that if he won he could and would fight inflation and cut spending and taxes). The *World-Herald* relates that Ike did cut the Budget and reduce expenses at first, but that now his course is unfortunately the other way. The editorial mentions a HUMAN EVENTS item of February 2, recalling Ike's 1952 speech and commenting thereon. In conclusion, the *World-Herald* urges its readers to write their Senators and Representatives in Washington, giving their views on this issue of economy.

Checking up on this matter with the offices of these members of Congress this week, the HUMAN EVENTS staff discovers that a "perfect avalanche" of mail has come in during the past week. Senator Curtis (R.) of Nebraska said it was "tremendous," "the biggest in a long time." Offices of other members of the Nebraska delegation had similar things to say. Almost unanimously the mail was in favor of cutting expenditures. Senator Curtis gave a TV interview for an Omaha station, in which he read from letters he had received: one said "the Budget can be cut by 6 or 7 billion dollars"; another, a Korean war veteran, remarked that he did not want any Federal Aid to Education voted because it meant Federal control. Other Nebraska members of Congress gave out statements backing economy in the Budget. Still others—in a desire to get constructive results—thought it a good idea to notify the White House of these sentiments from irate voters.

Newsmen in China: In the hue and cry (most of it quite unfair to the Administration) raised over the case of William Worthy, Baltimore *Afro-American* correspondent who entered Red China and who may be liable to prosecution by the Government, a number of arguments advanced in the newsman's defense are being derided here as "laughable."

Foremost among these was the claim voiced by James Reston of *The New York Times*. Reporters in China would not be "used" by the Communists, said Reston, because they do not take things at face value, or swallow Government handouts. "If there is any solid tradition of American reporting," he wrote, "it is the tradition of skepticism toward Government pronouncements. Nobody in the world has added so much to this tradition of skepticism as the Communists, for they have lied to reporters more than other officials."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Capital comment on Reston's argument: the kind of reporters that he cites as too sharp to be fooled by the Reds are just the kind that serve the Communist purpose in their dispatches from Iron Curtain countries. Far from being skeptical, it is said, these "liberal journalists" fall hard for the big lie that the Reds want to get over to the outside world: that their rule is invincible, and that they cannot be dislodged from their position as slavemasters. This line, which paralyzes Western anti-Communist policy, was shown for what it was worth in the months before the uprisings in Eastern Europe. (See "The Debacle of the Liberal Journalists," by Eugene Lyons, in the article section of this issue.)

On his return to the United States, correspondent Worthy, who touched off the dispute, was quoted by the *Daily Worker:* "My greatest single impression is that the Communist regime in China will last."

Atoms for What? Senate guns opened up last week against the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency, in gestation during the three years since President Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" speech in December, 1953. The agency, which would supply atomic materials to needy member nations, is to include Soviet Russia and her satellites. The question in many legislative minds: won't participation put the United States in the position of supplying her enemy with the raw material for atomic weapons? Authoritative voices so far have answered this question with a unanimous "yes."

This key point worries Senator John W. Bricker (R.-O.), who is pressing for a thorough investigation before the Senate ratifies the treaty that would put America in the agency. Senator McCarthy, speaking before last week's Chicago meeting of the Abraham Lincoln National Republican Club, also raised the issue: the agency, he said, although billed as "Atoms for Peace," is "potentially an 'Atoms for War' program."

The issue now being aired on Capitol Hill was discussed in all its particulars by David Shea Teeple in the January 12, 1957 issue of *National Review*, and pointed out almost two years ago by Dr. Medford Evans, writing in the article section of HUMAN EVENTS (March 26, 1955). Dr. Evans contrasted America's "defense" program with the proposed plan for sharing our nuclear materials with the Soviet Union. "The atom pool," he wrote, "makes our defense program seem either silly or wicked." It is "a proposal to share the revolutionary materials and information which make [our] defense possible with the only potential enemy who makes any large-scale defense necessary."

Labor Front: Students of the organized labor movement say that behind the facade of anti-racketeering unity, the AFL-CIO is torn by more serious internal dissension now than at any time since it came into being 14 months ago. Items:

George Meany and Walter Reuther are feuding heatedly over who is spokesman for the organization on foreign policy. Meany thinks he is, as President of the AFL-CIO, and is telling Reuther to make his brother, Victor, stop sending messages abroad in the name of the organization. Reuther says the hard anti-Communist line of Meany's foreign policy advisor, onetime Communist leader Jay Lovestone, is hurting the cause of both the AFL-CIO and the United States abroad.

The Executive Council made no progress toward settling the increasingly serious jurisdictional disputes between 19 former AFL Building Trades unions and ex-CIO outfits with industry-wide contracts. If no agreement is reached, this one ultimately could lead to withdrawal of the 19 construction units and creation of a new rival federation under the leadership of the potent, albeit odoriferous, Teamsters Union.

Long-time antipathies and jealousies are preventing amalgamation of AFL and CIO organizations at state and local levels in a majority of areas — for example, Michigan, where feeling between Walter Reuther of the Auto Workers and Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters is such that no neutral observer can conceive of any voluntary merger. The basic unification agreement provides that state and local level mergers must be completed by the end of this year; observers say the only way that could be accomplished would be by having them imposed by the Executive Council, a step deemed highly improbable.

OTC: A new Administration drive is in the making to persuade Congress to authorize United States membership in the highly controversial Organization for Trade Cooperation, the international "Free Trade" setup for which plans were drafted two years ago, but which will not start functioning until and unless this country participates.

OTC is supposed to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the tariff-cutting agreement under which this country has reduced import duties on numerous items to the point where many domestic industries are being forced to the wall.

One of the major arguments against the OTC authorization is that it would constitute indirect Congressional approval of GATT. U.S. participation in that agreement is administrative, under the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old New Deal Reciprocal Trade Agreements program legislation; Congress on several occasions has refused affirmatively to give it any specific authorization.

OTC legislation was approved last year by the House Ways and Means Committee but died in a House Rules Committee pigeonhole. This year, President Eisenhower plugged it in his State of the Union, Budget and Economic messages. This week, he gave it another and lengthier boost in his annual report to Congress on the trade agreements program.

Private word is that the Administration is trying to doctor up the authorization legislation in some form to make it more palatable to the legislators, who fear it would simply give greater power to Executive Branch tariff cutters.

Says Speaker Rayburn: "There are a good many protectionists in the country now." Says House Republican Leader Joe Martin: ". . . a tough one to pass." Say impartial observers: two masterpieces of understatement.

The Gore Report: As analysts continue to delve into the voluminous and controversial report of the Gore Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, more facts develop casting doubts on its credibility. The cumulative findings indicate that the Republicans got a raw deal from Democratic investigators Gore and Mansfield (see HUMAN EVENTS for February 9, 1957). Latest development in the dispute is a fact unearthed by the objective Washington research organization, *Congressional Quarterly*. CQ states, in its *Weekly Report* for February 8, that campaign spending by organized labor exceeded two million dollars. The Gore report, while it contains this information in an attached exhibit, gives play to a figure of less than half that amount, $941,271 — the sum that labor spent directly for newspaper advertising, radio and TV time, etc. An additional, and unemphasized, $1,078,852 (all but four thousand of it, CQ notes, going to the Democrats) went for contributions to candidates and their committees.

Boycott the Reds: Pressures mount across the nation to sever relations with the Soviet Union. Last week saw the establishment of the "Citizens' Foreign Relations Committee," which will attempt, among other objectives, to organize sentiment for the withdrawal of recognition from the Soviet Union and its puppet governments. The Executive Committee of the organization includes James H. R. Cromwell, Charles Edison, Alfred Kohlberg, and General A. C. Wedemeyer.

Meanwhile, a postcard campaign, in which individual citizens send cards to President Eisenhower (White House, Washington, D. C.), saying "Boycott the Reds — Sever Diplomatic Relations Now," has been spreading at the grass roots. Citizens who write urge their friends to do likewise, to "snowball" their efforts. The campaign has received the endorsement of the Knights of Columbus in Delaware. Readers who would like to get others to join the campaign, in addition to sending cards themselves, should write to "Boycott the Reds," 2200 R St., N.W., Washington 8, D. C., and request a copy of the covering letter used to urge participation.

Award to Bow: Congressman Frank T. Bow (R.-O.), who has led the long battle against the Status of Forces treaty putting American servicemen in the hands of foreign courts, will receive recognition next week for his work in pointing out to the American people the consequences of this hotly debated agreement. The Defenders of the American Constitution will give Bow their "Benton Memorial Award" February 26.

Dinner: The annual dinner of the Good Government Society will be held Friday, February 22 at the Hotel Statler, Washington, honoring Senator Karl Mundt and Representative William M. Colmer. Tickets $20 a plate at American Good Government Society, 1624 "Eye" St., N.W., Washington, D. C.

Letter from MORRIE RYSKIND, Film Writer: "For six days every week, via newspapers, magazines, radio and TV, I am subjected to a thorough brainwashing by professional cerebellum-lavers like Walter Lippmann, Ed Murrow and the Alsops, who argue sweetly and persuasively that black is white, that two and two make five and that Yalta was Roosevelt's finest hour. Then, on that blessed seventh day, comes HUMAN EVENTS — and, with it, the restoration of sanity."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS
HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 7 HUMAN EVENTS February 16, 1957

Article Section

THE DEBACLE OF THE LIBERAL JOURNALISTS

Uprisings Refute Claim that Red Slaves "Love Their Chains"

By EUGENE LYONS

AMONG THE LESSER but notable casualties of the Hungarian rebellion, the Polish uprising and the current tremors of unrest in the USSR, are the slew of Americans who in the year or two preceding these developments inspected and solemnly reported upon the Soviet scene. If any of these assorted journalists, Senators, businessmen, college-student delegations, clerical missions and garden variety tourists sensed the turmoil under the totalitarian calm, they failed to record it clearly enough to impress even an aficianado of hurry-up expertism like myself.

The standard report, with only variations in emphasis, had it that the Kremlin's subjects, if not wildly happy, were at least resigned and inert. The Russians in particular, it found, were proud of "Soviet achievements" and loyal to the dictatorship. In some instances the ten-day or four-week authorities even professed to have observed general enthusiasm for the Communist way of life, patriotic unity and a conviction of superiority over the benighted non-Communist world.

This all but unanimous judgment, particularly in regard to the satellite states which some of the pilgrims included in their researches, seems remarkably obtuse in the light of recent events.

Think back, for instance, to the drivel poured forth in the press and on the air waves by the several groups of American college boys and girls upon their triumphal return from Soviet expeditions. They naturally had probed the mind of their Soviet equivalents in long and, as they all attested, "frank" sessions on Russian campuses. Though Moscow itself now admits alarm over the ferment of discontent among students, the young Americans sensed none of it. Two of them whom I interviewed for a New York radio program assured me that Soviet students were honestly unaware of the existence of concentration camps in their country!

OR REREAD THE SERIES of dispatches in *The New York Times* from Eastern Europe in October and November 1955 by one of its ablest correspondents, Jack Raymond. Raymond spent some weeks in conscientious browsing in Rumania, Hungary and, more briefly, Czechoslovakia.

The people of Budapest seemed to Mr. Raymond "remarkably effervescent" in a good-natured style and inclined to voice grievances, whereas those of Bucharest appeared tight-lipped and dour. In one Rumanian port town, Constanta, he noted "sharper evidences of apathy to communism" and throughout that country he detected an "atmosphere of tenseness and suspicion."

But he attached little if any basic significance to such symptoms. On the contrary,

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his over-all verdict was "an impression of strongly installed governments" in Hungary and the other two puppet nations. He could report without a line of doubt or dissent: "Long-term resident observers believe that the satellites have their situations well in hand. There is said to be no possibility of the overthrow of those regimes, the major sources of effective opposition having been eliminated."

In short, a trained observer failed to see even faint shadows cast by events to come in Hungary, or to guess at the profound hatreds and despairs lurking under the genial "effervescence" of its population. "One cannot help being impressed by the reconstruction of the bridges of Budapest," he cabled, but not a hint of the reconstruction of minds then vigorously under way. Yet the revolt of the Hungarian intelligentsia was already massive and overt by the time Mr. Raymond arrived.

Against the background of recent satellite developments, Mr. Raymond must today be questioning whether even the Rumanian regime has its situation "well in hand." Having seen the indoctrinated youth, veteran Communists and even local Red armies take the lead in uprisings, he must be wondering about the glib premise that "the major sources of effective opposition have been eliminated."

IN A HUMAN EVENTS essay last year I cited a conspicuous example of the ease with which experienced reporters are taken in by the outward serenity that almost always prevails in a police state. I picked on Stewart Alsop, only because he was the most prominent of the American journalists then giving Soviet Russia a quick once-over and rushing into print with categorical opinions.

Having sojourned in the Soviet land for fully a month, Mr. Alsop committed two articles in the *Saturday Evening Post* which, one presumes, he would gladly expunge today if he could. They dealt with "The Smug Smug Russians" who, he reported, were not only reconciled to their Soviet fate but "really think their system is superior." He declared himself "sure" that "the Soviet workers do not know they are being ruthlessly exploited" — that "the Soviet citizen has been successfully taught to love his chains, or at least to be unaware that he is wearing them."

This all-embracing conclusion, I pointed out, "has been par for the course for nearly four decades: the routine impression gathered in naive honesty by newcomers." Recently Mr. Alsop has begun to worry about the shallowness of his on-the-spot findings, what with strikes in several Soviet factories, the Kremlin's distress over restiveness among the youth, ever bolder pressures for some "creative freedom" by writers and artists, the defection of Soviet soldiers and officers in Hungary to the freedom fighters and other such symptoms.

In two recent Alsop brothers columns we read intimations that after all the Soviet citizens may not be as "smug smug" or as in love with their chains as Stewart allowed himself to be persuaded. They indicate that there has been "at least a partial breakdown of the iron authority of the Soviet regime" even "within the center of power, Soviet Russia itself." They concede the possibility that the Soviet people have a "second mind" which they do not exhibit to casual callers.

The Alsops blame Stewart's misleading judgment on "all Western experts," explaining that "no so-called expert believed that any satellite population could do what the Hungarians have done." But this simply isn't true. For many years certain specialists on Soviet affairs have warned against the mischievous mistake of underrating the will to liberation both in the Red colonial empire and in Russia proper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Evidently the Alsops and most other architects of American public opinion managed to remain unaware of these warnings or arbitrarily ignored them. They found it easier to coast along with the majority view, geared to the dream of permanent "peaceful coexistence" and an Eisenhower-type *modus vivendi.* It happens to be a comfortable view, since it evades the labors and risks of a dynamic anti-Communist policy and, by justifying inaction, gives inertia an impressive look of superior wisdom.

Nor have the explosions in Eastern Europe and the increasing ferments in the USSR as yet unsold the average American observer on the eternal "finality" of the Soviet system.

RECENTLY ERIC JOHNSTON came home after a brief Soviet visit filled to the brim with business negotiations. An interviewer, alluding to Poland and Hungary, asked him whether "a similar popular discontent might be spreading in the Soviet Union itself." His answer was short and explicit: "I should say not." The interviewer pressed the point: "Then you would say that the revolt of the satellites has had no effect on the Soviet Union?" To which Mr. Johnston replied that, while it undoubtedly affected the leaders, he didn't believe "it has had any effect on the people."

His conclusions, of course, may prove to be right, though I do not think so. But surely a few days with the big Soviet brass scarcely suffice for a broad judgment on the secret "second mind" and inner feelings of 200 million people. Mr. Johnston, it is fair to surmise, was expressing long preconceived notions rather than discoveries made on this trip.

Joseph C. Harsch of the *Christian Science Monitor,* who also traveled in Russia and its European empire during the past year, gave his readers as little hint of the explosions then building up as did Alsop or Raymond. And he sticks to his verdict, at any rate so far as the USSR is concerned. True, there are rumblings in Russia but, he wrote recently, "it seems doubtful that any real 'wave of restlessness' has yet 'swept the heart of the Soviet Union.' " Why this is so he doesn't say, apparently writing on intuition. As to the students and workers who've been making the news, he says, they are less rebellious than "amused and bored."

If there are in fact overt expressions of amusement and boredom with the vindictive Kremlin regime, they must be bracketed with the seemingly innocent "effervescence" his colleague found in Hungary. But they are, I suspect, less frivolous than Mr. Harsch supposes. For one thing, the objects of the amused ennui are rather grim matters, like forced labor, the total suppression of free thought, police terror, universal economic wretchedness — which even dehumanized Russians do not find laughable. For another, the price of luxuries like open derision can come too high, beginning with expulsion from school and ending with the concentration camp.

I have space for only one more sampling of the curiously stubborn wish to write off the Soviet peoples as forever lost:

In the January *Atlantic,* Edward Crankshaw, a prolific and often perceptive British writer on Soviet Russia and communism, points out that the West had been deceived by appearances in Poland and consequently was unprepared for the events that began with Poznan and, for the moment contained by Gomulka, bid fair to burst into the open again. However, having thus acknowledged the Western failure to recognize the seething emotions under Poland's policed surface, he boldly demonstrates his own continuing inability to recognize analogous turmoil below the surface in Soviet Russia proper.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Throughout the length and breadth of Russia," he writes, "there has not been a flicker of the spirit which pushes men to the barricades, there has been no burning call to freedom — only an insistent, dull, sulky demand for amelioration. There is no nobility in this demand, no pride."

This seems to me a truly astonishing statement, as well as a cruel insult to Russians as human beings, in the light of the heroic slave revolts in Vorkuta and other forced labor colonies; the decades of resistance matched by hysterical purges that have helped populate those colonies; the Tiflis demonstration last year in which a hundred young people were slaughtered by machine guns; the recent ferment in the universities, as admitted by the official press.

THOSE WHO CANNOT detect in such things any elements of nobility and pride, any flicker of the barricades spirit, seem to me deficient in imagination and sympathy. They do not realize that under a terror regime a simple "demand for amelioration" suggests desperation and calls for exceptional valor; that a sit-down strike in Leningrad or Moscow can be more significant than a general strike in England, and certainly requires more courage. They forget, too, that Poznan began with mere demands for "amelioration" and that the Hungarian revolution was touched off by demands which, in retrospect, seem restrained and tepid.

Perhaps I am being too harsh. After all, journalists and tourists cannot be blamed for failing to see more than the surfaces in areas under the awful disciplines of unlimited terror. It is not a question of assigning blame but of pinpointing their failure and its consequences. For in the aggregate their reports, today as in the past, help to surround the Soviet realm with an aura of permanence and invulnerability, and this makes vigorous anti-Communist policies seem futile if not quixotic. The political moral implicit, and sometimes explicit, in their findings is that a settlement freezing the world half-slave half-free is the best that we can hope for or dare strive for.

Even a tentative admission that the Red empire and Russia itself might be sprung from within could not easily be fitted into moods of appeasement and live-and-let-live delusions. Plain horse sense would then dictate that we act to deepen and exploit the internal Soviet tensions, just as the Communists intensify and exploit tensions in the non-Soviet world.

The eagerness to accept the "finality" of Communist dominion over a third of the human race; the assumption that Russians and East Europeans have a perverted relish for slavery and love their chains; the refusal to acknowledge the existence of tens of millions of actual or potential allies of the free world in the Communist orbit — these have been at the heart of Western weakness and cold-war defeats. It is the quintessence of defeatism. And the speed-up experts, with their rough-and-ready confirmation of the tragic errors, are unwittingly doing a vital job for the Kremlin.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $25 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

Eugene Lyons is one of America's foremost authorities on the Soviet Union and the satellite states. A Senior Editor of the *Reader's Digest,* he is the author of *The Red Decade* and *Our Secret Allies: The Peoples of Russia.*

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED